



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/448,153	11/24/1999	PAUL S. GERMSCHIED	33012/278/10	4720

7590 09/10/2003

CHARLES A JOHNSON  
UNISYS CORPORATION  
LAW DEPARTMENT M S 4773  
2470 HIGHCREST ROAD  
ROSEVILLE, MN 55113

EXAMINER

ZAND, KAMBIZ

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2132

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2003

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1924

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/448,153

Applicant(s)

GERMSCHIED ET AL.

Examiner

Kambiz Zand

Art Unit

2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 November 1999 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. **Claims 1-20** have been examined.

### Drawings

2. New formal drawings are required in this application because original drawings by the applicant were objected to by the Draftsperson under 37 CFR 1.84 or 1.152. Please see attached PTO-948.

3. Page 30 of the specification is missing. Correction is required

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: Item "208" on Page 31, line 10; item "331" on page 36, line 13-14. Correction is required.

5. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: "56" in fig. 3; "101; "142 and 174" in fig. 6; "178,182,184,186,188,190,192,194,196,198 and 206" in fig.7; "208" in fig. 8; "246,252,266,268 and 274" in fig.9 and "114" in fig. 5. Correction is required.

***Specification***

6. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Updating of CROSS REFERENCE TO CO-PENDING APPLICATIONS information on pages 1-3; page 23, lines 2-3; page 36, line 10; etc... of the specification.

Appropriate correction (updating) is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. **Claims 1-5,7-10,12-15 and 17-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 2-5,7-9,12-15 and 17-20, the "wherein.." phrases makes the claims indefinite and unclear in that neither means nor interrelationship of means are set forth in these claims in order to achieve the desired results expressed in the "wherein..." phrases.

In claims 2-5,7-9,12-15 and 17-20, the "wherein.." phrases makes the claims indefinite and unclear in that neither method steps nor interrelationship of method steps are set

Art Unit: 2132

forth in these claims in order to achieve the desired results expressed in the "wherein..." phrases.

9. Claims 1-5 recites the limitation "the improvement" in the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

10. Claims 4-5, 9-10, 14-15 and 17-20 recite the limitation "the internet" in the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

11. Claim 10 recites the limitation "the world wide web" in the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) The invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily

Art Unit: 2132

published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

13. **Claims 1-4, 6-8, 11-14 and 16-18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Child et al (6,341,352).

**As per claims 1 and 6** Child et al (6,341,352) teach a data processing environment and an apparatus having a user terminal responsively via public ally accessible digital data communication network to a data base management system having at least one data base, having an expired password transferred from said user terminal to said data base management system identifying a potential security level; and a reassignment facility within said data base management system which assigns a new password to said user terminal (see abstract; fig.4-5; col.3, lines 2-26 and col.6, lines 8-55 wherein by receiving the expired password a new password is issued to the user ).

**As per claims 2 and 7** Child et al (6,341,352) teach a data processing environment and an apparatus according to claims 1 and 6 wherein said reassignment facility further comprises a query process which queries said user terminal for parameters associated with said new password (see col.3, lines 8-12 wherein a dialog box is presented to the user to queries the definition of new password by the user).

**As per claims 3 and 8** Child et al (6,341,352) teach a data processing environment and an apparatus according to claims 2 and 7 wherein said reassignment facility automatically assigns said new password in response to receipt of said expired password (see col.3, lines 23-25).

**As per claims 4, 10, 14 and 17** Child et al (6,341,352) teach a data processing environment and an apparatus according to claims 3, 9, 13 and 16 wherein said reassignment facility further comprises the internet (see col.4, lines 20-25).

**As per claims 11 and 16** Child et al (6,341,352) teach a method and an apparatus utilizing a user terminal to access a remote data base management system having a data base via a public ally accessible digital data communication network (see fig.1 and 3) comprising: transmitting a service request from said user terminal (see fig.3, transmission of a or requesting of changing password as a request or fig.4, item 70); receiving said service request by said remote data base management system (see fig.4, item78 receiving the request); and creating an empty data set by said data base management system in response to receipt of said service request (see fig.4, item 80 and 82).

**As per claims 12** Child et al (6,341,352) a method according to claim 11 wherein said creating step further comprises defining said empty data set in response to parameters

Art Unit: 2132

associated with said service request (see fig.4, item 82 and fig.5 wherein based on user request for changing password a dialog has been created that has parameters field associated with the request that requires user's input).

**As per claims 13** Child et al (6,341,352) a method according to claim 12 wherein said creating step further comprise creating said empty data set within a repository of said data base management system (see fig.5 and col.7, lines 23-64).

**As per claim 18** Child et al (6,341,352) an apparatus according to claim 17 wherein said permitting means for generating and transmitting a service request requesting said data base management system to execute said creating step (see col.6, lines 62-67).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. **Claims 5, 9-10, 15 and 19-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Child et al (6,341,352) in view of Broomhall et al (6,292,904 B1).



**As per claims 5, 9, 15 and 19** Child et al (6,341,352) teach all limitation of the claim but do not disclose a MAPPER. However Broomhall et al (6,292,904 B1) teach data base management system is MAPPER (see col.6, lines 14-22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to utilize Broomhall's data base management Mapper in Child's password security policy system in order to map user's input parameters with issued password to authenticate or issue a new password to the user.

**As per claim 10** Child et al (6,341,352) teach a data processing environment and an apparatus according to claims 3, 9, 13 and 16 wherein said reassignment facility further comprises the internet (see col.4, lines 20-25).

**As per claim 20** Child et al (6,341,352) teach an apparatus according to claim 19 wherein said permitting means further comprises an industry standard personal computer (see col.4, lines 26-28).

### **Conclusion**

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U.S.Patent No. US (5,944,825 A) teach security and password mechanisms in a database system.

Art Unit: 2132

U.S. Patent No. US (6,484,264 B1) teach method for providing repeated contact with software end-user using authorized administrator.

U.S. Patent No. US (5,956,400 A) teach partitioned information storage system with controlled retrieval.

U.S. Patent No. US (6,389,282 B1) teach operation and maintenance system for a mobile communications network.

U.S. Patent No. US (6,161,185 A) teach personal authentication system and method for multiple computer platforms.

U.S. Patent No. US (6,502,195 B1) teach computer readable storage medium for providing repeated contact with software end-user.

U.S. Patent No. US (6,571,191 B1) teach method and system for recalibration of an electronic control module.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kambiz Zand whose telephone number is (703) 306-4169. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (8:00-5:00). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (703) 872-9306. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

After-Final (703) 746-7238

Official (703) 746-7239


Application/Control Number: 09/448,153  
Art Unit: 2132

Page 10

Non-Official/Draft (703) 746-7240

Kambiz Zand

09/04/03

  
GILBERTO BARRON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100